

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending and stand rejected. Claim 11 has been amended. By way of this Response, Applicant hereby traverses the rejections.

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crites in view of Palm. Claim 1 recites, among other things, identifying appliances available to render media, receiving a definition of a plurality of activities, each activity specifying an appliance and a media source, and displaying an indication of activities.

In contrast, Crites fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. For example Crites teaches, at, *e.g.*, col. 6, lines 12-22 (*i.e.*, that portion of the Crites reference that the Examiner cites as teaching the relevant limitations), that underlying each general-media programming object is a media-specific object that may be created under the direction of an application program 52, by some other process in a computer 20, or by a remote server. The media-specific object has interfaces that allow the general-media object to locate the corresponding media source. However, Crites does not in any way disclose that each activity specifies an appliance and a media source. Moreover, Crites does not in any way disclose that an indication of activities is displayed.

In addition, as the Examiner acknowledges, Crites fails to teach identifying appliances available to render media. Further, while Palm does appear to disclose appliances available to render media, Palm in no manner teaches a method, such as is required by Claim 1, within which such appliances are identified. Additionally, Palm fails to supply other limitations missing from Crites, namely receiving a definition of a plurality of activities, each activity specifying an appliance and a media source, and displaying an indication of activities.


25315

CUSTOMER NUMBER

- 5 -

IMPL-1-1013ROA

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM ^{PLLC}


701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, Washington 98104
206.381.3300 • F: 206.381.3301

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the limitations of Claim 1 are not unpatentable over Crites in view of Palm.

Claim 2-10

Claims 2-10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crites and Palm in view of WMP7. WMP7 fails to supply the limitations missing from Crites and Palm, namely identifying appliances available to render media, receiving a definition of a plurality of activities, each activity specifying an appliance and a media source, and displaying an indication of activities. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the limitations of Claim 1 are not unpatentable over Crites and Palm in view of WMP7. As such, Claims 2-10 are patentable by virtue of their dependency from Claim 1.

Claim 11

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crites and Palm in view of Hatakeyama. Amended Claim 11 recites retrieving an indication of controls used to control and corresponding to media of an identified media type, and displaying a media bar for controlling the rendering of the identified media on the appliance wherein buttons of the media bar have the same shape and position regardless of the media type and wherein icons on the buttons change depending on the media type.

In contrast, Crites fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 11. For example Crites teaches, at, *e.g.*, col. 5, lines 36-65 (*i.e.*, that portion of the Crites reference that the Examiner cites as teaching the relevant limitations), that FIG. 5 shows a general-media programming object 60 implemented by media stream controller 53. Such an object is created for every desired media stream and/or source, including both analog and digital sources. It includes the following interfaces, which are common to all general-media programming objects; regardless of whether they represent analog or digital media services, and regardless of whether they represent file-based sources or tuner-type sources. As such, Crites, rather than teaching retrieving an indication of controls corresponding to media of an identified media type, teaches

retrieving an indication of controls common to all general-media programming objects. Additionally, Palm/Hatakeyama fails to teach retrieving an indication of controls used to control and corresponding to media of an identified media type.

Moreover, as the Examiner acknowledges, Crites/Palm fails to teach displaying a media bar for controlling the rendering of the identified media on the appliance wherein buttons of the media bar have the same shape and position regardless of the media type and wherein icons on the buttons change depending on the media type. Hatakeyama, at, *e.g.*, FIGS. 7a-7c does appear to teach buttons, but the icons associated with the buttons are located on a display above the buttons. As such, Hatakeyama fails to teach media-bar buttons having icons thereon, much less icons on buttons that change depending on media type.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the limitations of Claim 11 are not unpatentable over Crites and Palm in view of Hatakeyama.

Claims 12, 17-18 and 22-23

Claims 12, 17-18 and 22-23 are patentable by virtue of their dependency from Claim 11.

Claims 13-16, 19-21 and 24

Claims 13-16, 19-21 and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crites and Palm and WMP7 in view of Hatakeyama. As an initial matter, the Applicant's attorney respectfully submits that the need to combine no fewer than four references seriously undermines the Examiner's position that the claimed invention is obvious. Moreover, WMP7 fails to supply the limitations of Claim 11 missing from Crites/Palm/Hatakeyama, as discussed above. As such, Claims 13-16, 19-21 and 24 are patentable by virtue of their dependency from Claim 11.

Claim 25

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crites and Palm and Hatakeyama in view of Partridge. As an initial matter, the Applicant's attorney respectfully submits that the need to combine no fewer than four references seriously undermines

the Examiner's position that the claimed invention is obvious. Moreover, Partridge fails to supply the limitations of Claim 11 missing from Crites/Palm/Hatakeyama, as discussed above. As such, Claim 25 is patentable by virtue of its dependency from Claim 11.

25315

CUSTOMER NUMBER

- 8 -

IMPL-1-1013ROA

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}



701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, Washington 98104
206.381.3300 • F: 206.381.3301

CONCLUSION

In view of the Remarks set forth herein, all pending claims stand in condition for allowance. If the Examiner disagrees with the positions advanced herein, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner, prior to issuing an action rejecting any of the pending claims, contact the undersigned to arrange a telephonic discussion of the application.

Name and Telephone Number of the Patent Attorney or Agent:

P.G. Scott Born
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491
Facsimile: 206.381.3301
Email: sborn@blacklaw.com

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}



Michael S. Smith
Registration No. 39,563
Direct Dial: 206.749.9888